UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/573,543	03/27/2006	Danut Bogdan	2003P13768	7334	
	7590 04/20/200 ENBERG STEMER LI	EXAMINER			
P O BOX 2480		CRUZ, LESLIE PILAR			
HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2826		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/20/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/573,543	BOGDAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Leslie P. Cruz	2826		

	Leslie P. Cruz	2826	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 March 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS API	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Acono event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (the MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) 	lvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth it ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sloset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on tending amount on tended statutory period for reply original contents.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 			•
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed and non-allowable claim(s).	•	·	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (l13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Leonardo Andújar/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2826	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 03/13/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues the lens unit, which is formed by the plastic lenses L1-L4, the lens holding cover 114, and the shield case 200, is supported by the housing 1. However, claim 16 recites "said lens unit includes a lens holder and said lens holder is supported by said circuit carrier substantially without being supported by said housing". Claim 16 recites that the lens holder, not the lens unit, is supported by the circuit carrier substantially without being supported by the housing. The Examiner interpreted the shield case 200 as the lens holder. Izumi et al. (Figs. 17A, 17B) depicts the lens holder 200 is supported by the circuit carrier substantially without being supported by the housing. Izumi et al. discloses in column 18 lines 53-59] that the lens holder 200 comprises leg portions 203 which serve to fix the lens holder 200 to the circuit carrier. Izumi et al. further discloses this fixing is made through fitting openings 202 provided in the leg portions 203 using screws or bolts. Applicant further argues Izumi et al. does not teach that the housing includes at least sections with a ring-shaped support formed thereon, and that the semiconductor element is disposed in the housing. Applicant argues that the chip 64 is not disposed in the plastic substrate 249, but rather the chip 64 is merely placed on top of the plastic substrate 249. However, the Examiner does not identify the plastic substrate 249 as the housing but identified the housing as reference numeral 1 shown in Fig. 17A of Izumi et al. Therefore, claim 16 is not patentably distinguishable over the Izumi et al. reference..

/Leonardo Andújar/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2826